

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 MEREDITH E. MCGLOWN,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 MELLBURG FINANCIAL GROUP INC.,
et al.,

13 Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:19-cv-0029-RSL

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL**

14 Plaintiff, Meredith E. McGlown, filed a “Complaint for a Civil Case Alleging Breach of
15 Contract.” Dkt. 4. Plaintiff’s motion for appointment of counsel has been referred to the
16 undersigned United States Magistrate Judge. Dkt. 6. Having reviewed the motion, the balance of
17 the record in this case and other cases that plaintiff has filed in this Court, plaintiff’s motion for
18 appointment of counsel is **DENIED**.

19 There is generally no right to counsel in a civil action. *See Campbell v. Burt*, 141 F.3d
20 927, 931 (9th Cir. 1998). The Court may appoint counsel for indigent civil litigants under 28
21 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), but only under “exceptional circumstances.” *Agyeman v. Corrections Corp.*
22 *of Am.*, 390 F.3d 1101, 1103 (9th Cir. 2004). To determine if “exceptional circumstances” exist,
23 the Court considers “the likelihood of success on the merits as well as the ability of the [plaintiff]

1 to articulate his claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved.” *Weygandt*
2 *v. Look*, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983).

3 This is the second complaint plaintiff has filed against the Mellburg Financial Group. In
4 2017, plaintiff filed a complaint in case number C17-1815- RAJ. That complaint like the present
5 complaint alleges among other things that Mellburg broke a contract; that plaintiff is the trustee
6 of a foundation and the Emerites of Saudia; and that assets have been obtained through threats,
7 murder and fraud. That complaint was dismissed on the grounds it is “frivolous and fails to state
8 a valid claim for relief.” *See* Dkt. 10 (C17-1815-RAJ). In view of all the pleadings plaintiff has
9 filed, she has not established there are “exceptional circumstances” to support her request for
10 appointment of counsel. Plaintiff has filed numerous complaints showing an ability to proceed
11 *pro se*, and has also not demonstrated this case is likely to succeed. Appointment of counsel is
12 thus not presently justified, and the Court **DENIES** the motion (Dkt. 6). The Clerk shall provide
13 a copy of this Order to plaintiff.

14 The Clerk shall provide a copy of this Order to plaintiff and to Judge Robert S. Lasnik.

15 DATED this 7th day of February, 2019.

16
17
18 

19 BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA
20 Chief United States Magistrate Judge
21
22
23